



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

trade should be strictly construed should not override a reasonable construction of the intention of the parties.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—DELEGATION OF POWERS—REFERENDUM.—A statute concerning juries was passed by the legislature and was to become effective only after receiving a majority vote at a general referendum to the people of the state. *Held*, statute valid and not unconstitutional as a delegation of legislative powers. *Hudspeth v. Swayze* (N. J.), 89 Atl. 780. See NOTES, p. 632.

CORPORATIONS—CHARITABLE CORPORATIONS—LIABILITY FOR TORTS.—Where the plaintiff, a stranger, had accompanied a sick friend to a hospital, a charitable institution, and was injured by falling into an elevator shaft negligently left unprotected by the defendant, it was *held*, she can recover. *Hospital of St. Vincent v. Thompson* (Va.), 18 S. E. 13. See NOTES, p. 636.

CORPORATIONS—MANUFACTURING CORPORATIONS.—By a constitutional provision stockholders of manufacturing corporations were exempted from the liability there imposed on corporations generally. *Held*, a corporation for the generation of electricity for distribution to the public is a manufacturing corporation within the meaning of the provision. *Vendor Inv. Co. v. Highland Canal & Power Co.* (Minn.), 145 N. W. 611.

The question whether a corporation for the generation of electricity is a manufacturing corporation under the various statutes and constitutional provisions is one on which the authorities are not in accord. Most of the older authorities and a number of the more recent cases hold that such a corporation is not a manufacturing corporation. *Frederick, Electric Light, etc., Co. v. Frederick*, 84 Md. 599, 36 Atl. 362; *Williams v. Park*, 72 N. H. 305, 56 Atl. 463.

In these cases the courts adhere to the earlier and more restricted definition of the word "manufacturer," holding, that to be a manufacturer one must produce a fabric or structure made from materials of some kind. In an early case it was said that on reason and principle a corporation for generating electricity should be held a manufacturing corporation but as the statute was meant to apply to those corporations which had, in the past, been considered as manufacturing corporations, the court held that the electric light company could not take advantage of the exemption allowed to manufacturing corporations. *Commonwealth v. Northern Electric Light Co.*, 145 Pa. St. 105, 22 Atl. 839. But recently in the same state it has been settled that corporations for generating electricity are manufacturing corporations within the terms of such statutes. *Commonwealth v. Keystone Electric, etc., Co.*, 193 Pa. St. 245, 44 Atl. 326. Modern authority favors such a construction of the laws regulating manufacturing corporations as to include within their terms, corporations for the production of electric currents. *People v. Wemple*, 129 N. Y. 543, 29 N. E. 808; *Beggs v. Edison Electric Co.*, 96 Ala. 295, 11 So. 381.